

### **REMARKS**

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of the subject application in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

Claims 1-5, 9, 10, 12, 13, 15-17, 19, and 21-31 are pending in the application, with claims 1, 4, 10, 13, 16, and 17 being independent. Applicant cancels claim 18 without prejudice, waiver, or disclaimer of the subject matter. Applicant amends claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 10, 12, 13, 15-17, 19, 21, and 24 to further clarify features of the claimed subject matter. Applicant adds claims 25-31 to further clarify features of the claimed subject matter. The original specification and drawings support these claim amendments and additions at least at page 1, line 21; page 3, lines 17-18; page 5, lines 24-25; page 9, lines 5-7; and page 11, line 18-page 12, line 9. These revisions introduce no new matter.

### **Claim Rejections 35 U.S.C. §101**

**Claims 1-5 and 9 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §101 as being allegedly directed to non-statutory subject matter.** Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Applicant respectfully asserts that Applicant's specification at least on page 4, line 10-page 5, line 5 defines computer-readable storage media as a statutory subject matter. Applicant thanks the Examiner for indicating during the interview that this rejection will be withdrawn.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the §101 rejection.

### **Claim Rejections 35 U.S.C. §103 A., B., C. and D.**

**A. Claims 1-5, 10, 12, 13, 15-18, and 22 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Number 6,115,611 to Kimoto et al. (hereinafter**

“Kimoto”) in view of U.S. Patent Number 6,240,360 to Phelan. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Independent Claim 1

Without conceding the propriety of the rejection and in the interest of expediting prosecution of the application, **independent claim 1** is amended as proposed during the interview and is believed to be in condition for allowance.

**Independent claim 1** recites a computer-readable storage medium containing instructions that are executable by a computer to perform steps comprising:

- sending a HyperText Transfer Protocol (HTTP) request that includes geographical coordinates of a mobile client in a header of the request;

- receiving a response from a server, the *response comprising:*

- a *geographically-dependent content* that is customized to the geographical coordinates in the HTTP request, and

- a *header including the geographical coordinates, and a valid radius indicator* indicating a radius from the geographical coordinates within which the geographically-dependent content is displayed on the mobile client;

- comparing a current location of the mobile client to the valid radius indicator;

- determining, by the mobile client, that the geographically-dependent content is no longer valid based on the comparing when the mobile client leaves an area encompassed by the radius; and

- sending a new HTTP request that includes new geographical coordinates of the mobile client in a header of the new HTTP request.

Applicant respectfully submits that no such computer-readable storage medium is disclosed, taught, or suggested by Kimoto and/or Phelan, alone or in combination.

Kimoto is directed toward “a mobile communicating system which can provide map information deduced for position information of a mobile terminal” (column 1, lines 9-11).

Applicant agrees with the Office that “Kimoto. fails to disclose the coordinates in a header of the request” (Office Action, page 4). Applicant has searched and failed to find any disclosure, teaching, or suggestion in Kimoto of coordinates in a header of a response.

Phelan is directed toward “[a] map request to a map server computer 11 from the client computer 10 [that] specifies the geographical coordinates of the map, which may be the bottom left corner of the map and the top right corner of the map or center point and scale, for example” (column 5, lines 4-8). Phelan discusses “map **requests** and information **requests** [that] may include any number of elements for an expandable list of parameters, including ... Latitude ... Longitude... [and] Radius in kilometers” (column 6, lines 25-32; emphasis added). Phelan also discusses that “the responses also contain longitude and latitude information” (column 5, lines 53-55). However, Applicant has searched and failed to find any disclosure, teaching, or suggestion in Phelan of response headers or responses including indications of a radius or zone.

Accordingly, Kimoto and Phelan, alone or in combination, do not disclose, teach, or suggest a “*response comprising: a **geographically-dependent content** that is customized to the geographical coordinates in the HTTP request, and a **header including the geographical coordinates, and a valid radius indicator** indicating a radius from the geographical coordinates within which the geographically-dependent content is displayed on the mobile client,*” as recited in Applicant’s amended claim 1.

As tentatively agreed during the interview, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the §103 rejection.

#### Independent Claim 4

Without conceding the propriety of the rejection and in the interest of expediting prosecution of the application, **independent claim 4** is amended as proposed during the interview and is believed to be in condition for allowance.

Independent claim 4 recites a computer-readable storage medium having stored thereon a hyperlink browser program, the hyperlink browser program being executable by a mobile computer to perform steps comprising:

accepting a designation of hyperlinked content from a user;  
obtaining current geographical coordinates of the mobile computer from a global positioning receiver associated with the mobile computer;

in response to user designation of hyperlinked content, sending a Hypertext Transfer Protocol (HTTP) request to a hyperlinked content network over a wireless transmission medium;

including the current geographical coordinates of the mobile computer in a header of the HTTP request; and

receiving and rendering a reply from the hyperlinked content network as a result of the HTTP request, the *reply comprising:*

*a geographically-dependent content, and*

*a header including a valid zone specification* that is returned to the hyperlink browser program indicating a range relative to the geographical coordinates in which the geographically-dependent content is valid, and the current geographical coordinates of the mobile computer.

Applicant respectfully submits that no such computer-readable storage medium is disclosed, taught, or suggested by Kimoto and/or Phelan, alone or in combination for at least the reasons asserted above with respect to independent claim 1 and discussed during the interview.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the §103 rejection.

### Independent Claim 10

Without conceding the propriety of the rejection and in the interest of expediting prosecution of the application, **independent claim 10** is amended as proposed during the interview and is believed to be in condition for allowance.

Independent claim 10 recites a mobile information system comprising:

- a mobile client running a mobile hyperlink browser to communicate with one or more remote servers, wherein a geographically-dependent hyperlinked content is available from the servers;

- wherein the mobile hyperlink browser sends resource requests to the servers;

- wherein a header of a resource request from the mobile hyperlink browser includes geographical coordinates indicating a current location of the mobile client;

- wherein the servers return a *response comprising:*

- a geographically-dependent content* having a valid zone specification indicating a geographical zone within which the geographically-dependent content is displayed by the mobile hyperlink browser, *and*

- a header including the geographical coordinates and the valid zone specification;* and

- wherein the mobile hyperlink browser invalidates geographically-dependent content when the mobile client leaves the geographical zone specified by the valid zone specification.

Applicant respectfully submits that no such mobile information system is disclosed, taught, or suggested by Kimoto and/or Phelan, alone or in combination for at least the reasons asserted above with respect to independent claim 1 and discussed during the interview.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the §103 rejection.

### Independent Claim 13

Without conceding the propriety of the rejection and in the interest of expediting prosecution of the application, **independent claim 13** is amended as proposed during the interview and is believed to be in condition for allowance.

Independent claim 13 recites a mobile information system comprising:

- a computer;
- a wireless communications interface that provides communications between the computer and a remote server over a wireless communications medium;
- a hyperlink browser that executes on the computer, the hyperlink browser sending resource requests to the remote server over the wireless communications medium;
- a positioning receiver that generates varying geographical coordinates indicating a varying location of the computer;
- wherein the hyperlink browser includes the varying geographical coordinates in a header of at least some of the resource requests;
- wherein the *remote server returns a header including the varying geographical coordinates and a valid zone specification in conjunction with a returned geographically-dependent content*, the valid zone specification indicating a geographical zone around the varying geographical coordinates within which the returned geographically-dependent content is displayed by the hyperlink browser; and
- wherein the hyperlink browser invalidates returned geographically-dependent content when the computer leaves the geographical zone specified for that returned geographically-dependent content.

Applicant respectfully submits that no such mobile information system is disclosed, taught, or suggested by Kimoto and/or Phelan, alone or in combination for at least the reasons asserted above with respect to independent claim 1 and discussed during the interview.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the §103 rejection.

### Independent Claim 16

Without conceding the propriety of the rejection and in the interest of expediting prosecution of the application, **independent claim 16** is amended as proposed during the interview and is believed to be in condition for allowance.

Independent claim 16 recites a hyperlink browsing system comprising:

- a plurality of servers that provide a geographically-dependent hyperlinked content on a wide-area network;

- a plurality of mobile clients that communicate with the wide-area network over a wireless communications medium, each mobile client having a varying location, a positioning receiver that generates varying geographical coordinates indicating the varying location of the mobile client, and a hyperlink browser that is responsive to user designations of hyperlinked content to send an HTTP request to servers and to render content that is returned in response to the HTTP request;

- wherein a header of the HTTP request includes current geographical coordinates of the mobile client;

- wherein the servers select and return *responses comprising:*

- a geographically-dependent content* to the hyperlink browser in response to the HTTP request depending on the geographical coordinates in the HTTP request; *and*

- a header including the current geographical coordinates of the mobile client and a valid zone specification* in conjunction with a the geographically-dependent content, the valid zone specification indicating a geographical zone around the current geographical coordinates of the mobile client within which the returned geographically-dependent content is displayed on the mobile client.

Applicant respectfully submits that no such hyperlink browsing system is disclosed, taught, or suggested by Kimoto and/or Phelan, alone or in combination for at least the reasons asserted above with respect to independent claim 1 and discussed during the interview.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the §103 rejection.

### Independent Claim 17

Without conceding the propriety of the rejection and in the interest of expediting prosecution of the application, **independent claim 17** is amended as proposed during the interview and is believed to be in condition for allowance.

Independent claim 17 recites a hyperlink browsing system comprising:

- a plurality of servers that provide hyperlinked content on a wide-area network, wherein at least some of the hyperlinked content is geographically-dependent;

- a plurality of mobile clients that communicate with the wide-area network over a wireless communications medium, the mobile clients having varying locations;

- the mobile clients having positioning receivers that generate varying geographical coordinates indicating the varying locations of the mobile clients;

- the mobile clients having hyperlink browsers that are responsive to user designations of hyperlinked content to send HTTP requests to servers and to render content that is returned in response to the HTTP requests;

- wherein the hyperlink browser of a particular mobile client includes current geographical coordinates of that mobile client in an HTTP requests header along with each HTTP request;

- wherein the servers select and return *responses comprising:*

- a geographically-dependent content* to the hyperlink browsers in response to the HTTP requests depending on the geographical coordinates in the HTTP requests; *and*

- a header including the current geographical coordinates of that mobile client and valid zone specifications* in conjunction with the geographically-dependent content, the valid zone specifications indicating geographical zones within which the returned geographically-dependent content is displayed on the mobile client.

Applicant respectfully submits that no such hyperlink browsing system is disclosed, taught, or suggested by Kimoto and/or Phelan, alone or in combination for at least the reasons asserted above with respect to independent claim 1 and discussed during the interview.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the §103 rejection.



Applicant cancels **dependent claim 18** without prejudice, waiver, or disclaimer of the subject matter. Accordingly, the rejection is now moot.

**Dependent claims 2, 3, 5, 12, 15, and 22** depend from one of independent claims 1, 4, 10, 13 and 17, respectively, and thus, are allowable as depending from an allowable base claim. These claims are also patentable for their own recited features that, in combination with those recited in claims 1, 4, 10, 13, and 17 are not disclosed, taught, or suggested by Kimoto and/or Phelan, alone or in combination.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the §103 rejections.

**B. Claims 9 and 21 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Number 6,115,611 to Kimoto et al. (hereinafter “Kimoto”) in view of U.S. Patent Number 6,240,360 to Phelan and further in view of U.S. Patent Number 5,471,205 to Izawa.** Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

**Dependent claims 9 and 21** depend from one of independent claims 1 and 17, respectively, and thus, are allowable as depending from allowable base claims. As mentioned above, the primary and secondary references do not disclose, teach, or suggest the features of independent claims 1 and 17. Applicant respectfully asserts that Izawa fails to compensate for the deficiencies identified in the primary and secondary references. Claims 9 and 21 are also patentable for their own recited features that, in combination with those recited in claims 1 and 17 are not disclosed, taught, or suggested by Kimoto, Phelan, and/or Izawa, alone or in combination.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the §103 rejections.

**C. Claim 19 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Number 6,115,611 to Kimoto et al. (hereinafter “Kimoto”) in view of U.S. Patent Number 6,240,360 to Phelan and further in view of U.S. Patent Number 5,504,482 to Schreder.**

**Dependent claim 19** depends from independent claim 17, and thus, is allowable as depending from an allowable base claim. As mentioned above, the primary and secondary references do not disclose, teach, or suggest the features of independent claim 17. Applicant respectfully asserts that Schreder fails to compensate for the deficiencies identified in the primary and secondary references. Claim 19 is also patentable for its own recited features that, in combination with those recited in claim 17 are not disclosed, taught, or suggested by Kimoto, Phelan, and/or Schreder, alone or in combination.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the §103 rejections.

**D. Claims 23 and 24 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Number 6,115,611 to Kimoto et al. (hereinafter “Kimoto”) in view of U.S. Patent Number 6,240,360 to Phelan and further in view of U.S. Patent Number 5,848,373 to DeLorme.** Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

**Dependent claims 23 and 24** depend from independent claim 17, and thus, are allowable as depending from allowable base claim. As mentioned above, the primary and secondary references do not disclose, teach, or suggest the features of independent claim 17. Applicant respectfully asserts that DeLorme fails to compensate for the deficiencies identified in the primary and secondary references. Claims 23 and 24 are also patentable for their own

recited features that, in combination with those recited in claim 17 are not disclosed, taught, or suggested by Kimoto, Phelan, and/or DeLorme, alone or in combination.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the §103 rejections.

Applicant respectfully submits that the cited references do not render the claimed subject matter obvious and that the claimed subject matter, is therefore, patentably distinguishable over the cited references. For all of these reasons, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the §103(a) rejection of these claims.

### **New Claims**

Applicant adds **dependent claims 25-31** to further clarify features of the claimed subject matter. Claims 25-31 depend from one of independent claims 1, 4, 10, 13, 13, or 17, respectively, and thus, are allowable as depending from an allowable base claim, as well as for the additional features that they recite. For example, Applicant has searched and failed to find any disclosure, teaching, or suggestion in the references of record of *“a mobile automobile computer comprising an interface with an automobile diagnostics module,”* as recited in Applicant’s claim 25.

### Conclusion

For at least the foregoing reasons, claims 1-5, 9, 10, 12, 13, 15-17, 19, and 21-31 are in condition for allowance. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections and an early notice of allowance.

If any issue remains unresolved that would prevent allowance of this case, Applicant requests that the Examiner contact the undersigned attorney to resolve the issue.

Respectfully Submitted,  
Lee & Hayes, PLLC

Dated: February 27, 2009

By: /Benjamin Keim/  
Benjamin A. Keim  
Reg. No. 59,217  
509-944-4748

Shirley L. Anderson  
Reg. No. 57,763  
509-944-4758